

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.org

Agenda Item 3

CRD2

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

20th Session

Kampala, Uganda, 2 – 6 October, 2017

COMMENTS ON DRAFT STANDARD FOR AUBERGINES

(Comments submitted by Philippines, Thailand, African Union)

Philippines

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 Minimum Requirements

The Philippines proposes to simplify the minimum requirements of aubergines on the following characteristics:

- Firm, whole and fresh in appearance
- Clean and practically free from any visible foreign matter
- Calyx and peduncle shall not be damaged
- Free from decay or deterioration;
- Free from damage by pests; and
- Not over mature

2.1.2 Maturity Requirements

The Philippines proposes that the term “sufficiently developed” be replaced with the term “**commercial maturity**”, and the line will read as this. The aubergine must reach commercial maturity without the flesh being fibrous or woody and without hard seeds.

JUSTIFICATION: Commercial maturity is the stage of development, when the plant or plant part possesses the necessary characteristics for use by consumers or consumer’s desire for particular purpose. Aubergines at the commercial maturity, to be supplied fresh are harvested immature or physiologically mature.

Commercial maturity could be measured by:

- 1) Number of days from sowing to first harvest which ranges from 50-55 days depending on the variety (PNS, 1997; IBPGR, 1990). At this stage the seeds of the fruit of aubergines are not enlarged and are still soft.
- 2) Fruit color or depends upon the variety or accession (IBPGR, 1990).
- 3) Fruit firmness, glossiness and not pithy. (Cantwell and Suslow, 1997).

Thus, the aubergines must be carefully harvested at **commercial maturity** or have reached an appropriate degree of development in accordance with criteria proper to the variety, accession, and/or commercial type and to the area in which they are grown.

3. Provision Concerning Sizing

The Philippines proposes sizing by weight for aubergines in order to simplify the standard which can be easily understood and followed during actual inspection as follows:

Table 1. Sizing by weight of aubergines.

SIZE Code	WEIGHT (grams)
1	>300
2	251-300
3	201-250
4	151-200
5	101-150
6	51-100
7	30-50

The basis for the classification of size of aubergine is the ASEAN Standard for Eggplant (ASEAN Stan 26:2012). The Philippine standard for size by weight of eggplant is within the ASEAN Standard. However, the range of weights per size code in the ASEAN Standard was modified so as not to overlap the values in two size codes to prevent confusion in the actual classification of the fruits when its weight fall on the overlapping weight. Table 2 and Table 2-a shows the ASEAN Standard and Philippine Standard for size classification of aubergines, respectively.

Table 2. Size classification of aubergines (ASEAN Stan 26:2012)

SIZE Code	WEIGHT (grams) ASEAN Standard
1	>300
2	>250-300
3	>200-250
4	>150-200
5	>100-150
6	>50-100
7	>30-50

Table 2-a. Size classification of aubergines (PNS/BAFPS 52:2007)

Size Classification	Weight (grams) PNS/BAFPS 52:2007
Small	50-100
Medium	101-200
Large	>200

References:

ASEAN Stan 26:2012. ASEAN STANDARD FOR EGGPLANT

IBPGR, 1990. Descriptor of Eggplant. International Board for Plant Genetic Resources, Rome

PNS/BAFPS 52:2007. Fresh Vegetables - Eggplant - Grading and classification. Philippine National Standard/Bureau of Agriculture and Fisheries Product, Quezon City, Philippines Standards

Cantwell, M. and T. Suslow. 1997. Eggplant: Recommendations for Maintaining Postharvest Quality. http://postharvest.ucdavis.edu/Commodity_Resources/Fact_Sheets/Datastores/Vegetables_English/?uid=15&ds=799 (Accessed August 14, 2017).

Thailand

2. PROVISION CONCERNING QUALITY

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

2.2.3 Class II, Third bullet

We wonder whether it is proper to allow sun-scorched aubergines in 2.2.3 Class II as sun-scorched aubergines could lead rapid spoilage to the flesh.

To avoid the inferior produce, we, therefore, propose to delete the words “or sun-scorched;”. The amend text should be read as follows:

“ slight bruising and/or slight healed cracks ~~or sun-scorched;~~ ”

3. PROVISION CONCERNING SIZING

We propose to use sizing table in this standard and rearrange size code in descending order.

We also propose to add the sizing by weight for elongated aubergines.

The sizing table and tolerances should be separated.

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

4.1.1 “Extra” Class

We would like to re-emphasize our concern that aubergines are highly perishable produce and we do not agree with the allowance on decay for aubergines in Extra class as decay caused by diseases and injuries. Rotting aubergine caused by fungal disease. The allowance on decay in fruits and vegetables should be considered on a case-by-case basis and we would like to reiterate our position on this issue in the codex standard layout as well.

The amended text would then read:

"Five per cent by number or weight, of aubergines not satisfying the requirements of the Class but meeting those of Class I is allowed. ~~Included therein, is 1% tolerance for decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown"~~

African Union

Issue: Format

In the Proposed Layout for Codex Standards for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables, the Standard starts with “Scope” followed by “Definition of produce”. The proposed draft Standard for Aubergines does not start with the “Scope”.

Position: AU proposes that the draft Standard starts with the “Scope” to harmonize with the formatting for the Proposed Layout for Codex Standards for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables.

Rationale: To harmonize with the formatting for the Proposed Layout for Codex Standards for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables

Issue: Section 2.1 Minimum Requirements

Bullet 2, States that “provided with calyx and peduncle which may be slightly damaged”.

Position: AU proposes deleting the word “provided” so that bullet 2 reads as follows; “with calyx and peduncle which may be slightly damaged”

Rationale: The calyx and peduncle are already attached to the aubergines, however the word “provided” suggests that the calyx and peduncle are being added to the aubergines before they are supplied to the consumer.

Issue: Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, under “Maturity requirements”

Position: AU proposes that Section 2.1.1 becomes part of Section 2.1 and that Section 2.1.2 under “Maturity Requirements” be re-numbered 2.1.1.

Rationale: To harmonize this Section of the Aubergines draft Standard with the Proposed Layout for Codex Standards for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables.

Issue: Section 3(b), “Provisions concerning sizing”

There is overlap in the weight sizing for example; 50g appears in two classes, that is; “20-50g” and “50-100g”.

Position: AU proposes adjusting the range for each weight size to prevent overlap. The new weight ranges should be “20-50g, >50-100g, >100-300g, >300-500g, >500g”.

Rationale: To prevent overlaps so that the same weight does not appear in more than one weight range.

Issue: Section 3(b)

The tolerances for sizing the weights between the smallest and the largest Aubergines are too small. For example, a tolerance of 10g between 20-50g means that we can have a minimum of 5 different packages eg; 20-29g, 30-39g, 40-49g, 25-34g, 35-44g.

Position: AU proposes that the tolerances should be increased for each of the weight size ranges and should be revised as follows: 20g instead of 10g, 30g instead of 20g, 100g instead of 75g, 125g instead of 100g and maintain 250g for Aubergines \geq 500g.

Rationale: This will reduce the number of distinct packages required to meet the sizing requirements in Section 3(b).

Issue: Section 3(b)

It is not possible to achieve the Statement “Uniformity in size is compulsory for Extra Class” because the statement suggests that within the weight range of for example 20-50g, there are 31 different uniform sizes. The number of uniform sizes increases as the weight of Aubergines increase to $\geq 500\text{g}$. Extra Class is determined by quality characteristics and not size of the Aubergines.

Position: AU proposes that the statement “Uniformity in size is compulsory for Extra Class” be changed to “Uniformity in size range is compulsory for Extra Class”.

Rationale: It is not possible to achieve a uniform size as there is a range of sizes prescribed for Extra Class. It is thus better to work towards achieving a uniform size range instead of a uniform size.

Issue: The current provision for Section 6.1.1:

“Nature of Produce does not require labeling of the package if the produce within the package is visible from the outside” is not appropriate because, labeling of the package should be required whether the contents of the package are visible from the outside or not and the produce name should be mentioned on the label.

Position: AU proposes revising the requirement as follows: “if the produce is not visible from outside” to read as follows; if “~~the produce is not visible from outside~~, Each package shall be labeled as to the name of the produce and may be labeled as to the name of the produce, variety and /or commercial type”.

Rationale: Labeling of the package should be required whether the contents of the package are visible from the outside or not and the produce name should be mentioned on the label.

Issue: Section 6.2.2, “Nature of Produce”

“Name of the produce “aubergines” if the contents are not visible from the outside. Name the variety and/or commercial type (optional).

Labeling of the package with the name of the produce “aubergines” should be required whether the contents of the package are visible from the outside or not and the produce name should be mentioned on the label.

Position: AU proposes revising the requirement as follows: Name of the produce “aubergines” if the contents are not visible from the outside. Name the variety and/or commercial type (optional). The same statement should be deleted from the subsequent paragraph to read as follows; mixture of aubergines or equivalent denomination, in the case of a mixture of distinctly different varieties (commercial types) of aubergines. If the produce is not visible from outside, The different varieties (commercial type) and the quantity of each in the package must be indicated”.

Rationale: Labeling of the package should be required whether the contents of the package are visible from the outside or not and the produce name should be mentioned on the label

Issue: Section 6.2.4, “Commercial identification”

Position: AU proposes that “size” should be expressed as minimum and maximum diameter of the equatorial (in mm); section on the longitudinal axes or by weight (in g).

Rationale: Sizing is done in accordance with the existing trade practices that require the package to be labeled with the size and method used. Moreover, this approach is being used in Section 7.2.4 of the Draft Codex Standard for Kiwifruit.